

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 1 has been canceled, claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form by incorporating therein the subject matter of claim 1, and dependent claims 2-6, 8-9 and 19 have been amended to be dependent on claim 7 instead of claim 1. Further, claim 21 has been canceled, and claims 22-25 have been amended to be dependent on claim 19 instead of claim 21.

Claims 2-9, 19 and 22-25 are pending in the present application. Independent claim 7, and claims 2-6, 19, and 22-25 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to a production method for a liquid crystal display wide viewing angle polarizing film, claim 8 is directed to a production method for a polarizing adhesion film dependent on claim 7, and claim 9 is directed to a production method for a liquid crystal display dependent on claim 7.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 5-9, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 2000-321426, the publication on November 24, 2000 of the Japanese application corresponding to US 6,404,469 ("Kitagawa"), claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kitagawa in view of US 5,220,447 ("Yokokura") and US 6,245,399 ("Sahouani"), and claims 19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kitagawa in view of Yokokura and SID 00 Digest ("Bobrov").

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. None of the cited references teaches or suggests forming a polarizing layer by laminating a polarizing layer through coating application of a polarizing-layer forming material onto an optical compensation film without using an adhesive. Namely, Kitagawa suggests coating a protective or compensating layer on a conventional polarizer, not coating a polarizing layer on a compensating plate (see

Kitagawa at col. 3, lines 36-37), Yokokura discloses placing a phase plate directly on a liquid crystal display element substrate or onto a polarizer without using an adhesive (see Yokokura at col. 4, lines 3-5 and 35-38), but there is no mention or suggestion in Yokokura of a coated film, let alone a coated polarizing film, and Bobrov shows a polarizing plate applied on a “glass surface” (Bobrov at page 1102, 8th line from bottom) and is also completely silent as to coating-application of a polarizing-layer forming material onto an optical compensation film without using an adhesive.

Further, contrary to the assertion made on page 2 of the Office Action, the introduction of Yokokura does not stand for a broad teaching or suggestion that “[i]t was well known that the optical properties of adhesives often caused undesirable optical effects.” Yokokura only discloses that “an adhesive necessary for attaching the film [phase plate of a plastic film having birefringence] has an influence, and the contrast therefore decreases according to the number of the attached films” (Yokokura from col. 1, line 67 to col. 2, line 2). Thus, this portion of Yokokura discusses the optical effect of attaching a phase plate discussed in Yokokura, but is completely silent as to any undesirable optical effects of an adhesive used for the lamination of a polarizing film. Even if, arguendo, a person of ordinary skill in the art were to become aware of generally applicable “undesirable optical effects” of an adhesive layer, that person would find no teaching or suggestion in Kitagawa or Yokokura regarding coating-application of a polarizing-layer forming material onto an optical compensation film without using an adhesive, or whether a thus resulting film would be beneficial or detrimental in terms of these optical properties.

In summary, a person of ordinary skill in the art would be aware that (i) it is generally difficult to form a polarizing layer onto a compensation layer without using an adhesive, and (ii) it

cannot be predicted whether forming a polarizing plate onto a polarizing layer through coating application in place of affixing a polarizing plate to a compensation plate by use of an adhesive would result in a wide viewing angle. Thus, in the absence of any teaching or suggestion in Kitagawa and Yokokura, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to eliminate the adhesive taught by Kitagawa for the lamination of a polarizing plate, and further, that person would not be motivated to use no adhesive by Yokokura because Yokokura is completely silent as to forming a polarizing layer through coating application, and as to any prediction of the resulting optical properties, in particular whether wide viewing angle properties are obtainable.

In addition, since Bobrov describes a polarizing layer but is completely silent as to forming a polarizing layer onto a compensation layer, Bobrov does not remedy the deficiencies of Kitagawa and Yokokura. Thus, even if, arguendo, a person of ordinary skill in the art were motivated to refer to Bobrov, that person would not find any teaching or suggestion regarding coating-application of a polarizing-layer forming material onto an optical compensation film without using an adhesive, let alone any prediction of the resulting optical properties, in particular whether wide viewing angle properties are obtainable. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over any combination of Kitagawa and/or Yokokura with Bobrov.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial Number: 10/047,528

Group Art Unit: 2871

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No.: 020612

Customer No.: 38834

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

NES:rep